

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/593,505	09/20/2006	Tiziano Brombin	377/9-2292	1698
28147	7590 01/10/2008		EXAMINER PARADISO, JOHN ROGER	
WILLIAM J. S COLEMAN S	UDOL SAPONE P.C.	•		
714 COLORA BRIDGE POR			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3721	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	01/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		H	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	•
, ·	10/593,505	BROMBIN, TIZIANO	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John R. Paradiso	3721	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap		vith the correspondence address	
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statul Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this communication ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 (control of the control of the c	is action is non-final. ance except for formal mate		s
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination.	cepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121((d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. nts have been received in a ority documents have bee au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application	

Art Unit: 3721

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/24/2007 have been fully considered. Examiner notes that the previous Office Action mistakenly addressed claims 1-6 and 9-10, when the rejection should have been directed to claims 1-11.

The rejection has been reprinted and the corrected version appears below. This action supersedes the previous Office Action.

Examiner apologizes for any confusion.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over BOUCHER (US 3172434) in view of ACHHAMMER (US 6185910).

BOUCHER discloses a method and apparatus for filling containers until a weighing device at a weighing station indicates the container is full. (see column 5:35-42).

BOUCHER does not disclose a bottle treatment station or step.

ACHHAMMER discloses a method and apparatus for bottling in which the bottles are moved through a disinfecting station (6) prior to filling.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of BOUCHER by adding the bottle disinfecting station taught by ACHHAMMER in order to provide greater cleanliness for the packaging process.

Regarding claim 3, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use hydrogen peroxide in the combination of BOUCHER and ACHHAMMER or whatever type of sterilizing / cleaning liquid is most effective against the type of contamination the operator wishes to remove, since soap and water and hydrogen peroxide are art-recognized equivalents for the sterilization of containers.

Regarding claim 4 and 7, the bottles of the combination of BOUCHER and ACHHAMMER would inherently produce a laminar flow of drying air due to the geometry of the containers: laminar flow initially, breaking into turbulent flow as the bottle curves.

Regarding claim 9, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make as many canals in the nozzle as necessary to provide the desired amount of airflow, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art.

Page 4

Application/Control Number:

10/593,505 Art Unit: 3721

Reference Citations

- The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent 4. to Applicant's disclosure:
- STRIEDIECK discloses a method and apparatus for cleaning articles in which articles are cleaned with a treatment liquid, after which the treatment liquid is collected in a lower portion of chamber (14) and then recirculated back by main deliver line (77).
- CLÜSSERATH ET AL discloses a method and apparatus in which bottles (2) are moved by means of a series of starwheel conveyors through each station. A rinser station (101) rinses the bottles (column 3:12-15)

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Paradiso. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday, 9:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. (ET).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada, can be reached at the number listed below.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the 3700 Technology Center Receptionist.

Examiner John Paradiso: (571) 272-4466

January 7, 2008

Additional Phone Numbers:

Supervisor Rinaldi Rada:

Fax (Official):

(571) 272-4467 (571) 273-8300

Fax (Direct to Examiner)

(571) 273-4466 (Drafts only)